

Chief, EE

14 February 1953

Chief of Base, Munich

Operational/CACUS

REF: ECM-A Q1168, 29 C 4 S 2

Carriage Examination of CACUS 4

1. Subject was examined further on 13 February 1953, at the request of █ in order to explore his ramified European contacts and increase control. By way of introduction, it was pointed out to the subject that we wanted to know about all the special contacts he had and check them all with Carriage, so that, if later on it developed that one or another of these contacts was "sour" we would be able to certify that the subject did not know of the fact. I then did a resume' interrogation concerning various individuals which lasted about two hours, and the results of which are summarized below:

- a. Heinz Fenner: Subject's formal statement concerning this man is attached as ATTACHMENT "A". See also statements in reference. Subject specifically denies any kind of clandestine working arrangement through or with FENNER.
- b. Rudolf ULLRICH: Statement on this man is part of ATTACHMENT "B".
- c. RICHTER (Georg): See ATTACHMENT "B". Richter recommended FALGE, Josef.
- d. FALGE, Josef: SEE ATTACHMENT "B" and ATTACHMENT "C" (If possible to reproduce it
- e. KAHN, Albert, Mr. See ATTACHMENT "B"
- f. RUPPOLT, Heinz, See attachment "D". (This is the man reported as RUPPRECHT in reference)
- g. WAGNER, Dr. Hans, see ATTACHMENT "D". Questioned as to the negotiations this individual undertook to bring peace in 1943, subject told the following story: WAGNER had proposed to CANARIS that he use a Jewish contact/sent by the Russian Govt. to Stockholm for the purpose of negotiating a peace between USSR and Germany. CANARIS agreed, and WAGNER proceeded, but HITLER soon found out about it, and WAGNER had to appear before KEITEL, where he was warned never again to undertake such a thing, no matter who gave him permission, on pain of death. Subject explained WAGNER'S safety in the 1944 assassination attempt as due to the fact that "everybody knew" that he would have no part in treason and that CANARIS had never attempted to recruit him because WAGNER was a man of honor and loyal through and through. Subject went on to state that some one else had published a book about this 1943 interlude, claiming most of the credit for himself — "Which made Dr. WAGNER angry, and he was going to sue, but I dissuaded him, because it would only attract more attention to the matter and do no good..." Subject is greatly attached to WAGNER. Subject has promised to try to provide us with a copy of the book in question. He states that WAGNER was always anti-totalitarian, but that his wife had at one time been pretty pro-Nazi.
- h. g. LIGOTSKY See ATTACHMENT "E": He did not take up with L., says CACUS 4, because he formed an instant ~~trust~~ <sup>confidence</sup> of the man, ~~as a possible~~ Russian agent.

NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT

COPY

EXEMPTIONS Section 3(b)  
 (1) Espionage  
 (2) Methods/Sources  
 (3) Foreign Relations

Declassified and Approved for Release  
 by the Central Intelligence Agency  
 Date: 2005

- i. JACOBS, J. See ATTACHMENT "E" tried to recruit Dr. WAGNER.
- k. SCHMALSCHLAEGER AND BAUN See ATTACHMENT "E"
- l. KUENZLER, E. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ A very close friend, who provides the subject with a cover story, and thereby also defrauds the Government of a substantial sum in income-tax which he avoids by deducting the pay of the subject (whom he does not allegedly pay) "for advice". K. makes something like DM1,500 per month, alleges employment of the subject as WIRTSCHAFTSBERATER. Subject alleges he has told KUENZLER (who was originally considered by us as a prospective agent) that he (subject) works at an American office. "KUENZLER only asked me: 'Is it for Germany?' and, when I said it was, he said: 'That is sufficient for me, if it is against the Communists?', which I also assured him it was..." Subject alleges he told KUENZLER that he is mainly engaged in writing "experience reports". K. has founded the new COLIKO-VIT Co., which is to supply "special foods" for the new German Army. (See also bottom ATTACHMENT "E").
- m. KUENZLER, H., See ATTACHMENT "E"
- n. BREM, Fritz, see para 9 ATTACHMENT "F".
- o. STEIDEL, fmu, Chief of HANS SPERK, see below.  
~~FF~~
- p. SPERK, Hans; source of ATTACHMENT "E". Subject considers him to be a thoroughly dependable fellow, but claims not to be sure whether SPERK actually may not have contacts with the SSD. He is an old and fast friend; were both disillusioned with politics, but Hans got in again. He also has or had a small printing business. Subject claims SPERK tells him these things simply because he wants a confidant and believes the subject can be trusted.
- q. SKORZENY, RUDEL, v. REICHENAU, NAUMANN : Subject claims not to know them.
- r. NADOLNY: Does not know him, but claims to know his son who resides at Chieming/Chiemsee.
- s. BUCK, Bernd: Of ROTEN KAPELLE fame. Subject claims no connections with him since 1943; believes he can be found in Wilhelmshaven or Hamburg.
- t. SLADEK, Paulus: Knows PRCHALA, subject will get in contact with him if we order.
- u. SRIVALIN, Viktor: A criminal whom subject investigated for IRO in 1951.
- v. GWALBERT, Strada: Was in Labor Service as policeman at NEUBIBERG. Good man.
- w. Johanna Knebl and Anni Wuensch: Local hotel workers who are anti-Communist.
- W. OERTZEN, Frau, see ATTACHMENT "F". Subject does not know her.
- x. GEHLEN, General, Subject knows he is up to something, believes that G. had "a pretty minor post in the Army" during the war; something to do with USSR, Abwehr, and CANARIS.
- y. KUN, Bela, FISCHER, Ruth, Somoyeli, etc., people subject worked against after World War I, when the Communist revolution in Hungary was in full swing.
- z. IWASCHKO, Ivan See REF. Subject advised me ~~about~~ once, at the request of this officer, investigated a Russian named SOLITAREJKO or something like that, <sup>he</sup>

and that he had enquired of one Frau-Gerda "KALVARAM, the man's landlady, who had, as far as the subject recalls, given a "very good reference".

aa. SEVEREFF, Grischa, was one of the sources of information about the corpse in Schleissheim (see RRF) that subject recalls, claims to be unable to recall the name of the "Chauffeur".

bb. CZESENKOWSKY, Seferin (Baron) see questions concerning income, next paragraph.

2. The following specific questions were put the subject, with results as shown:

Have you told me the truth about your connections? Yes. (Clear).  
Do you knowingly maintain secret connections with the SSD of the IER? No. (Clear).

Note: On telling the subject: "I am going to ask you about a young lady in Munich...." there was no reaction. It appears that subject's ~~recent~~ statement that he is 100% faithful to his wife (although he is still quite personable) is true.

During the War were you in CSR? Yes. (Clear).

Did you protect the inhabitants of the CSR frequently against the NAZIS? Yes.

Slight reaction. Subject alleged he had helped many, simply because he was "humane". (See also questions re secret funds, below.) Subject appears to at least a good extent to have done such assistance-work, since he would otherwise have reacted much more strongly — especially if he had done the reverse. Subject makes many protestations of "Menschlichkeit" and "Christian Morality" and professes a right-wing Republican type of political philosophy. Ordinarily such protestations arouse suspicion, but in this case I am inclined to view them merely as a harmless eccentricity and cover for the subject's main aim, which is to engage in espionage and make a good living thereby.

Do you know the gentlemen: Dr. Hans Wagner and Richard Kuenzler? Yes.

Have you lied to me about Dr. Wagner and Mr. Kuenzler in any way? No.

Subject appears to be in the clear on these questions.

Have you a secret source of income besides us? No.

Other than you told me, have you a secret source of income? No.

These questions caused the subject concern. On interrogation he stated that he knew one Seferin CZESENKOWSKY (Baron), now a physician at the MUNICIPAL SANATORIUM, Oatville, N. Y., with whom he had had the following relations: In 1943 Czes. came to see subject to "get some girl off the police hook, as she was innocent but in danger of her life because of various slanders..." Subject alleges that he tore up the file against her after investigating the case, but that the name of the girl now escapes his mind "in fact the whole occurrence is hazy in my mind".... I asked him whether he did not take a great risk in doing this sort of thing (i. e., aiding Czechs), and subject said he had once even helped a Communist ("who was a decent man") and nearly got into serious trouble over it. Subject had known Czes. before that in Flsn, where he (Czes.) had been director of the JANOFF Sanatorium, but did not know him well. Subject denied taking bribes in this and similar cases in which he helped Czechs during the war. That was the last he saw of Czes., until in 1951 "the Secretary of Czes." approached the subject and said that Czes. wanted to take up contact again with the subject and thank him for rescuing the girl in 1943. The two men now struck up a close friendship. Subject oft

had dinner at Czes.'s home, and came to be very fond of Czes.'s children, especially since he was at that time separated from his own family. In 1951 Dr. Czes. had an automobile accident and had to post bail of DM 1,000. At that time subject alleges he had savings of DM 1,800, so that he advanced the sum to Czes., without interest. The verdict was two month's suspended sentence and DM 1,000 fine against Czes., so that the court transferred the bond money to satisfy the sentence. Czes. was in a desperate situation at that time, because, if he had not been able to pay, he would not have been allowed to emigrate... Subject alleges Czes still owes him about DM 146 and that he had received remittances from abroad from Czes of \$10 or \$20 at a time through legal channels (converted to DM by the Banks); also two \$5.00 green notes sent in the mail. Subject corresponds with Czes., but alleges he did not think of him as a "contact" in the sense of the interrogation I had done at the outset, as this was merely a personal friend. (CONTINUED BELOW)

As far as you know, were you born in Teplitze? Yes. (Clear).

In connection with this question, subject suddenly popped up with a strange statement: "He said, "I am sure I was born in ~~REICH~~ Teplitze, but I can not guarantee I am Aryan .... after all, who knows ~~what~~ his father is.... my mother could have played around, you know...." Subject did not apparently intend this as a joke, and as a ~~pink~~ qualifying statement it was strangely out of place. He did not lose composure, either, as he normally would if this were some weird statement that just popped out of his mouth. He added, "That is not to say that I think I am partly Jewish, or anything like that...." (Or words to that effect.) It is only in retrospect that the statement takes on its importance, since, if the subject had some doubts as to his ancestry (actual as ~~pink~~ opposed to legal, since he must certainly have been investigated as to racial origin by Gestapo) it might help ~~it~~ explain his predisposition to help the subject peoples. Otherwise this predisposition might seem grounded in a trait of character or disposition to aid the underdog which might, under certain circumstances, come to be an obstacle to us -- especially if coupled with any latent tendency to ignore the intent of orders given him. Unfortunately I did not at the time think to ask him whether he believes he may be of non-Aryan ancestry. Perhaps, however, the subject, who is very shrewd, was trying to provoke this line of thought....

ADDENDUM to income questions: To the question: Other than you told me, have you secret sources of income? (No) subject continued to be sensitive. He explained he expected eventually to receive from the Government: DM 150 tax-refund; 550 DM household help, as a totally expropriated person; a pension according to para 131, amount unknown, as regulations have not been promulgated. He denied any and all other sources. To the question: Have you source of income from another I.S.? No., subject showed no significant reaction. To the question: "Besides the DM 460, have you other debts?" (No) subject appears to be telling the truth. (He explained he owes this to ~~xxxxxx~~ his wife for funds advanced to Drs SCHNEWEISS, BOHNISCH and KOLB in connection with his defense against extradition in Austria.) To the additional questions: "Have you another source of money?" (No); "Are you mainly interested in money?" (No); "Did you tell me the truth about your sources of income?" (Yes); subject showed enough sensitivity so that one has to report that he ~~probably~~ has something on his mind with regard to these questions that he does not care to disclose (and may not feel we are entitled to know.) This, whatever it is, does not appear to be serious, as, in spite of a considerable harassment-program undertaken on this point, a real anxiety never was built up, such as would be normal to this subject if he were concealing something vital or even serious. It would seem logical to expect, in any case, that a person of this type (He states he "saved DM 4,000 while working for IRO"...) who has lived black so many years, might well have developed some sources he would not think were our business. I believe the subject is strongly attached to ~~money~~ and has a fondness for it that is by no means unusual in the World. ~~SECRET~~

Do you knowingly maintain secret connections with Genl. GERLEN and his group? No.  
Have you a secret intention to work against us with another secret group? No.

Slight reactions, which do not appear to be proportional to any kind of serious concealment and are probably referable to the great stress which has been put on our suspicions on this point. No admissions.

Have you lied to me about your connections since 1945? No.

Slight reaction, same comment as above.

I am going to ask you a question about blackmail.

Are you being blackmailed by anyone? No.

Subject showed no sensitivity in this area and appears to be free from blackmail.

3. Estimated accuracy of results: On the basis of the control-reaction obtained in the money question, I believe the results ~~may~~ in spite of the "re-run" effects, be considered "fairly accurate". Subject is known as an "electrodermal" reactor, and these reactions are often difficult to estimate as to importance.

4. Remarks: At no time in the course of this examination did subject's reaction-characteristics approach the level of strength which they would have, had he been attempting anything in the nature of a vital concealment. We know from the results of his first test that he also reacts strongly cartiographically when he becomes/concerned. I am making some allowance for sensitivity in the field of "German contacts" because the subject has now been so greatly amplified in CACTUS 4's mind by the various interrogations (see interrogation by   I would recommend, however, that all the people mentioned be checked, including particularly Seferin CZECHOWSKY. In a year or so another Cartiage might be advisable.

3-EX  
3-COM  
3-MOB/C

Chrom,

With Attachments: A- F.